

relation to feudalism, as indeed feudalism was a higher social system than slavery.

Two antagonistic class camps

The main contradiction in world politics today is not at all what the exponents of China's new policy say it is (which in any case has undergone several changes in the course of the struggle with USSR revisionism). The main contradiction, the main and fundamental antagonism, is between imperialism on the one hand, meaning thereby the U.S. and all other imperialist states, including Japan, and on the other all the socialist countries—China, the USSR, etc.—plus all the oppressed people and the world proletariat.

These, in reality, constitute the two great class camps in the present contemporary epoch. The fact that there is struggle in the camp of the working class, which occasionally may even break out into armed struggle, does not alter the fundamental class antagonism between the two irreconcilable class camps, the two antagonistic social systems based upon two different classes.

The USSR is itself a contradictory social phenomenon, on top of which sits a heavy-handed bureaucracy which has a *dual character*. This is most strikingly shown in its capacity to play both a progressive as well as a reactionary role in domestic and foreign policy. It is utterly impossible to understand the Soviet Union unless one takes into account this characteristic of the Soviet ruling stratum.

Soviet leaders play a contradictory role

It explains why all those who immediately took on faith the Chinese characterization of the USSR as a capitalist or social-imperialist state now find themselves at a loss how to explain the truly progressive role the Soviet Union has played in Angola. They must ask themselves, how is it that revolutionary China supported the reactionary puppet cliques of the FNLA and UNITA while the "social imperialists" supported the revolutionary cause of the Angolan people? How is this to be explained?

Granted that an imperialist power might occasionally give material support here and there to a revolutionary cause, what imperialist power has given both material and political support

to a revolutionary regime in complete hostility to all the other imperialist powers? And is Angola really the exceptional situation, the sole exception? What about Cuba itself? What about Vietnam?

Need we enumerate all the situations where the Soviet bureaucracy has played a progressive role on the international arena?

The Soviet Union's assistance to Angola is merely a continuation of what it did in Cuba. And even when the USSR sent missiles to Cuba in 1962, did the Chinese leadership call it social-imperialist then? Not at all, although they criticized the introduction of the missiles as adventurist and Khrushchev's retreat under U.S. pressure as capitulation and appeasement, while supporting Cuba against the U.S. But whatever the validity of these sharp criticisms, they were addressed to the *policies of the leadership* and were not attacks on the Soviet system—as in the case of Soviet aid to Angola. Yet what has really changed since then?

The fact of the matter is that there would scarcely have been a controversy over Angola were it not for the split between China and the USSR. And conceivably there might not have been a split between China and the USSR had not the Soviet workers' state been under the leadership of a bureaucracy.

China's leaders cross class lines

Nonetheless, whatever the origin of the struggle between China and the USSR leadership on principled political issues, as well as on matters concerning relations between states, China's characterization of the USSR as an imperialist power meant an abandonment and renunciation of class criteria in the struggle against revisionism.

It is one thing to attack the Soviet leadership as revisionists, renegades, opportunists, and so on. It is qualitatively different and a crossing of class lines to write off the Soviet Union itself and the social system that prevails there.

The most unfortunate aspect of this struggle is that a good deal of the movement here (and abroad as well) took China's hasty generalization about the USSR on pure faith, without subjecting this new and most dangerous departure from Marxist analytical method to any discussion whatsoever!

It should be remembered that by the time the generalization